DEFENSE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

DIRECTORATE OF RESEARCH

PERSONALITY AND PREJUDICE

by

Judith Lynn Johnson, Ph.D.
Department of Behavior Sciences & Psychology
Louisiana Tech University
Ruston, Louisiana
Summer Faculty Research Fellow

Summer 1997

19980318 065

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY *(Leave blank)*	2. REPORT DATE 15 February 1998	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final - June-August 1997

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Personality and Prejudice

5. FUNDING NUMBERS

G - N00014-94-0515

6. AUTHOR(S)

Judith L. Johnson

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

Directorate of Research
Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute
740 O'Malley Road MS9121
Patrick Air Force Base, Florida 32925-3399

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

RSP 97-5

9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

Office of Naval Research
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, Virginia 2232

10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE

13. ABSTRACT *(Maximum 200 words)*

This paper examines authoritariansim and prejudice from the perspective of contemporary personality theory and literature. Historical theories are reviewed, concluding with current views on right-wing authoritariansim. Factor-based models of personality are presented, along with empirical findings relating the factors of Psychoticism, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience to authoritarianism. Future directions for research are presented, and potential intervention strategies are outlined.

14. SUBJECT TERMS

Personality, Theory, Prejudice, Authoritarianism

15. NUMBER OF PAGES

16. PRICE CODE
20

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UNLIMITED

PERSONALITY AND PREJUDICE

by
Judith L. Johnson, Ph.D.
Summer Faculty Research Fellow

Abstract

This paper examines authoritarianism and prejudice from the perspective of contemporary personality theory and literature. Historical theories are reviewed, concluding with current views on right-wing authoritarianism. Factor-based models of personality are presented, along with empirical findings relating the factors of Psychoticism, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience to authoritarianism. Future directions for research are presented, and potential intervention strategies are outlined.

Summer 1997

PERSONALITY AND PREJUDICE

...prejudice is more than an incident in many lives; it is often lockstitched into the very fabric of personality...

Gordon Allport--1954, p. 408

Introduction

Contemporary definitions of prejudice have varied, but there is some consensus regarding major features of this construct. For example, writers generally agree that prejudice is an inter-group phenomenon valenced with a negative attitudinal orientation (Ashmore, 1970). However, there is extensive disagreement regarding whether prejudice is necessarily "bad" or dysfunctional (Duckitt, 1992). Thus, although prejudice refers to a negative outlook directed towards members of a certain group, the extent to which prejudice is dysfunctional is sometimes disputed.

Parallels to this issue exist regarding many constructs within the general domain of personality research. For example, Dickman (1993), writing on impulsivity, made the distinction between functional impulsivity (playfulness) and dysfunctional impulsivity (dangerous spontaneous behavior). For purposes of the present paper, prejudice is defined as "An attitude towards members of a specific group, leading to a negative evaluation of them on the basis of that membership" (Vaughan, 1988, p. 2).

Many theories of prejudice are sociocultural in nature. Socioeconomic status, group competition or conformity, and social power models have all been invoked to explain prejudice. Alternative theories promote personality features such as personal rigidity or lack of tolerance in the development and maintenance of prejudicial and stereotypical views of human differences. For example, Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) proposed the notion of the authoritarian personality to explain why certain individuals are prone to prejudice and hatred of different groups. Similarly, Allport (1954) discussed the "tolerant personality" as distinct from prejudiced individuals.

Although these and other constructs may have certain utility in conceptualizing prejudice from a personologic perspective, they are limited in that concepts such as Authoritarianism and tolerance do not represent major factors of personality. That is, these constructs are more appropriately viewed as lower level traits of larger personality factors. Hence, explanatory power is limited in that traits typically intercorrelate to compose a larger factor. Similarly, some authors (e.g., Eysenck & Eysenck, 1963) have relegated traits to the status of "habits," and these habits "are notoriously shifting, difficult to classify and pin down" (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1963, p. 56). Thus, it is more parsimonious and ultimately more accurate to analyze larger factors of personality influencing general tendencies, as opposed to lower levels of analyses. The purpose of the present paper is to examine prejudice from an individual difference perspective emphasizing factor-based models of personality.

1

Contemporary factor-based models of personality include Eysenck's Three-factor (Eysenck, 1982) and the Five-factor (Digman, 1990; McCrae, 1992) Models of Personality. The three-factor model includes the factors of Neuroticism (excessive emotionality), Extraversion (outgoing other-directedness), and Psychoticism (tough-minded cynicism). The five-factor model includes Neuroticism and Extraversion and has three additional factors of Openness to Experience (imaginative, aesthetic inclinations), Conscientiousness, and Agreeableness.

These empirically derived and validated models will be more fully reviewed and the relation between these models and prejudice will be examined. Of special interest are the personality factors of Neuroticism, Psychoticism, and Openness to Experience, and the extent to which these personologic variables contribute to racial prejudice. Potential intervention strategies for reduction of prejudicial attitudes specifically designed from a personologic perspective will be identified.

Although the literature on prejudice is dominated by an emphasis on sociocultural contributants, it is important to examine the role of personality for several reasons. First, certain aspects of personality can be modified. For example, the low self-esteem component of Neuroticism can be treated through psychosocial approaches which, in turn, can reduce prejudice (e.g., Bagley, Verman, Mallick, & Young, 1979). Similarly, an individual who is closed to experiences and excessively conventional can develop self-awareness of these tendencies and their role in prejudicial attitudes. At the very least, identification of these tendencies may enable an individual to self-monitor characteristics that foment prejudicial attitudes.

A second major reason to examine personality and prejudice is theoretical. Although prejudice is typically viewed as an intergroup phenomenon, it is important to establish why individuals may self-select into groups, particularly into "hate groups" such as the Ku Klux Klan. Knowledge regarding the personality characteristics of individuals attracted to such groups may lead to preventative strategies or identification of individuals at "high risk" for group membership.

Historical Perspectives: Adorno, et al. (1950); Allport (1954); Rokeach (1960)

The role of personality in prejudice gained increased scrutiny after World War II when the holocaust and other acts involving prejudice and anti-Semitism were committed (Duckitt, 1992). In addition to examination of sociocultural variables, researchers began to search for attitudes and personality differences that distinguished prejudiced from non-prejudiced individuals.

Another impetus to the exploration of personality and prejudice was the important finding that prejudice is generalized (Hartley, 1946). That is, individuals who are hostile towards one group (minority or outgroup) tend to be that way towards other groups. This feature strongly suggests that certain individual difference variables (such as personality) moderate individual acquisition and maintenance of prejudice.

With respect to individual difference variables, early studies identified certain beliefs endorsed by individuals high in prejudice. This supported the idea of the prejudiced personality. For example, Allport (1954) cites the Frenkel-Brunswik (1948) study on children high in prejudice who endorse the following beliefs:

There is only one right way to do anything.

If a person does not watch out somebody will make a sucker out of him.

It would be better if teachers would be more strict.

Only people who are like myself have a right to be happy.

Adults endorse:

The world is a hazardous place in which men are basically evil and dangerous.

We do not have enough discipline in our American way of life.

Even in this early literature, a theme emerges of a rigid perspective emphasizing right and wrong. Additionally, a mistrustful or cynical stance towards others and the world in general is evident.

Authoritarianism (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950)

In 1950, Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford published research on Authoritarianism, which was measured with the Fascism Scale (F Scale). Authoritarianism is believed to underlie prejudice and includes such characteristics as strong needs for structure and the need for a power hierarchy. High scorers on the F scale tend to score high on measures of ethnocentrism and anti-Semitism. Additionally, they score high on measures of anti-minority sentiment. These individuals are generally more conservative than those scoring low on the F Scale. Items from the F Scale that correlate with high Authoritarianism include the following:

I often find myself disagreeing with people. (yes)

Would it upset you a lot to see a child or animal suffer? (no)

I am easily convinced by the opinions of others. (no)

Do you have enemies who want to harm you? (yes)

Adorno, et al. (1950), presented nine characteristics of Authoritarianism measured by the F Scale. The first two characteristics are those of conventionalism and authoritarian submission. This involves a rigid adherence to conventional values and a submissive attitude toward authorities of the ingroup. The third characteristic, authoritarian aggression, involves a tendency to monitor, reject, and punish individuals who violate conventional values. The fourth, authoritarianism involves anti-intraception, or an opposition to the phenomenological, imaginative, or tender-minded aspects of human existence. The next characteristic is that of superstition and tendencies towards stereotyping. Not only does this include mystical beliefs regarding fate and destiny, but tendencies towards rigid and dichotomous thinking.

The next four characteristics identified by Adorno, et al. (1950) can be generally subsumed under the construct of tough-mindedness. Authoritarians are preoccupied with power relationships including such dimensions as strong-weak, leader-follower, and dominance-submission. They readily identify with powerful figures and may display an exaggerated toughness. This is combined with the seventh characteristic, that of cynicism. In this vein, cynicism refers to a mistrust and skepticism towards humanity and good intentions. Humans are not to be trusted and their intentions are suspect and generally negative. Similarly, the eighth characteristic, projectivity, is the tendency to believe that strange, wild, and dangerous things occur in the world. Finally, the authoritarian has an exaggerated concern around sexual issues, and may believe that many people are involved in illicit sexual activity.

Notably, many severe criticisms regarding the psychometric qualities of the F Scale exist in the literature, shedding doubt on some of the Adorno et al. (1950) findings. Perhaps the harshest criticism targets the fact the F Scale is not unidimensional. Thus, it is measuring more than one construct. Indeed, writers such as Altemeyer (1981) attribute the inconclusiveness of the literature on Authoritarianism to the F Scale's psychometric inadequacy.

Later writers such as Robert Altemeyer (1981; 1988) refined the notion of the authoritarian personality into three (out of the above nine) major variables. This literature will be reviewed later in the paper.

Prejudiced and Tolerant Personalities: Allport (1954)

Allport (1954), a contemporary of Adorno, summarized the characteristics of the prejudiced (authoritarian) personality. These include moralism (conventional virtues), dichotomization (not seeing the middle ground), need for definiteness (intolerance of ambiguity), externalization (tendency to see things as happening to them and projection of blame), institutionalism (high need for predictable social order), and Authoritarianism (high need for a power hierarchy).

4

These characteristics combine to describe an individual with a strong need for order who is rigid in both belief system and behavior. Such an individual likely needs a structured environment with well-defined roles. Predictability in the environment and social relations is valued, and deviation from a defined course of action is subject to disapproval.

It is important to note that viewing these characteristics as a constellation of traits suggests a major theme of the individual needing to structure their environment in order to reduce threat. One who perceives the world as a threatening place may resort to "safety through exclusion" (Allport, 1954, p. 441). The person "clings to a narrow island, restricts his circle, sharply selects what reassures him and rejects what threatens him" (Allport, 1954, p. 441). In contemporary terms, such an individual may be described as low in the personality factor of Openness to Experience.

In contrast to the prejudiced personality, Allport introduced the notion of the tolerant personality. A major characteristic of the tolerant personality is insight and self-awareness regarding shortcomings and strengths. In contrast to the prejudiced personality, which tends to focus on outward entities, tolerant individuals are more self-directed and have less of a need for outward authority. Perhaps related to this is a tendency for tolerant individuals to be generally more inwardly focused, with greater interest in imaginative processes, artistic activities, and theoretical reflections. Additionally, these individuals tend to accept personal responsibility for life difficulties, as opposed to externalizing through blaming others. A tolerance for ambiguity is present and there is no need to dichotomize.

Finally, tolerant (or democratic) personalities are viewed as more affiliative in nature, perhaps because they are able to trust others. Allport writes that they possess self-trust, made possible because "security has been experienced in the realistic handling of inner conflicts and social transactions" (Allport, 1954, p. 441).

As noted earlier, integration of the characteristics of both the prejudiced and tolerant personalities within the perspective of the five-factor model of personality points to the likely importance of the personality factor of Openness to Experience. That is, the intolerance for ambiguity, tendencies to dichotomize, and excessive needs for structure are likely associated with a lack of openness to new ideas and experiences.

Within the three-factor model of personality, the characteristics of the prejudiced personality and Authoritarianism would likely relate to Psychoticism, or the P Factor. A cynical "hard-nosed" individual who experiences the world as a threatening place fits the description of High P individuals. On a less theoretical and more empirical level, the role of Neuroticism in prejudice has been examined (e.g., Bagley et al. 1979) Hence, there are important theoretical reasons to investigate the relation between Openness to Experience, Psychotism and prejudice, and to further examine Neuroticism.

Dogmatism: Rokeach (1960)

Another important writer of the time was Rokeach (1960), who authored *The Open and Closed Mind*. It is important to note that Rokeach was seeking a conception of prejudice that was ahistorical and based upon individual belief systems. Thus, he was not specifically addressing personality; however, some of his concepts are useful with respect to individual differences in prejudice.

Rokeach coined the term "Dogmatism" to specifically refer to a constellation of features including a closed way of thinking that is independent of specific ideologies, an authoritarian outlook on life, intolerance of those with opposing beliefs, and affinity for those individuals holding similar beliefs. A closed-minded individual would have a strong tendency towards dogmatism and these terms are used interchangeably throughout his book. Dogmatism and closed-minded individuals are contrasted with open-mindedness or lack of dogmatism.

The open mind is more flexible than the closed mind. Authority is not absolute, and individuals should not be evaluated with respect to their extent of agreement with authority. In contrast, the closed mind views authority as absolute and is evaluative regarding people who disagree with the authority. Rokeach also wrote that the open mind views the world as a friendly place while the closed mind views it as a threatening place.

Rokeach developed a scale designed to measure open and closed-mindedness, the Dogmatism scale. Examples of closed-mindedness items include:

> There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth. (agree)

> I sometimes have the tendency to be too critical of the ideas of others. (agree)

> I am sure I am being talked about. (agree)

Later researchers disputed the validity of this scale, though it does correlate with Authoritarianism. Although Rokeach made important and thought-provoking contributions, later researchers have pointed to the inconclusiveness of the literature regarding cognitive flexibility and prejudice (Altemeyer, 1981). As is typical of the literature in general, the measurement of the construct via the Dogmatism Scale was inadequate, which introduced tremendous error into research findings. Indeed, Altemeyer (1981) concluded that "Technically, the D Scale is an even bigger nightmare than the F Scale" (p. 90), and registered pronounced dissatisfaction with the validity of the research findings within the general area of authoritarianism.

Despite the difficulties associated with Rokeach's notion and measurement of dogmatism, these concepts again point to the likely importance of the personality factor of Openness to Experience in prejudice. An individual high in dogmatism would be low in this factor, and the converse would also apply.

Contemporary Right-Wing Authoritarianism: Robert Altemeyer (1981; 1988)

The most prolific contemporary writer on authoritarianism is Robert Altemeyer, who authored *Right-Wing Authoritarianism* (1981) and *Enemies of Freedom* (1988). Altemeyer presents extensive research findings into right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) in these two volumes. Through factor analysis and item analysis, Altemeyer identified a small group of items of the original F Scale that covaried sufficiently to suggest measurement of a unitary construct. Three of the nine groups or clusters of characteristics from the Adorno et al. (1950) work were identified. Altemeyer conceptualized these three as composing right-wing authoritarianism and they include conventionalism, authoritarian submission, and authoritarian aggression. Conventionalism is defined as adherence to social conventions that are endorsed by society and its established authorities. Authoritarian submission refers to unquestioned submission to established and legitimate authorities. Authoritarian aggression refers to generalized aggression that is sanctioned and approved by established authority towards various individuals. It is important to note that all three of these central attitudes must be present to constitute the right-wing authoritarian.

Altemeyer developed the Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWA), which is a psychometrically sound instrument (Duckitt, 1993) with demonstrable cross-cultural validity (Rubinstein, 1996). Scores on the RWA share a moderate to high correlation ($r = .40$) with generalized prejudice towards minorities. Representative items include the following:

> Laws have to be strictly enforced if we are going to preserve our way of life. (true)

> Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down. (true)

> Being kind to loafers or criminals will only encourage them to take advantage of your weakness, so it's best to use a firm, tough hand when dealing with them. (true)

High scorers on the RWA are characterized as aggressive and punitive towards a target sanctioned by conventional authority. High scorers also view the law as the basis for morality and readily support government persecution of certain groups. Importantly, high scorers on the RWA are aggressive towards both right-wing and left-wing entities, as long as the aggression is government sanctioned. Finally, high scorers are fearful of the world as a dangerous place and have high levels of self-righteousness and a self view as morally superior. Altemeyer (1981) concluded that individual differences in Authoritarianism formed an underlying susceptibility to prejudice and ethnocentrism.

Duckitt (1992) notes that Altemeyer's work was crucial in correcting psychometric weaknesses in the measurement of Authoritarianism. However, Duckitt further notes that many questions still remain and concludes that the issue of identification of an underlying individual-

difference construct is unresolved. In other words, "what underlying construct pulls these together into a single unitary and coherent dimension" (Duckitt, 1992, p. 209). Duckitt then presents a model of Authoritarianism that conceptualizes the construct in terms of social identity theory. In short, this theory views the covariation between the conventionalism, authoritarian submission, and authoritarian aggression (described by Altemeyer) as a product of identification with a social group. This identification promotes a need for cohesion within the group (manifest by shared beliefs and conformity) with concomitant intolerance of non-group members. Duckitt notes the need for empirical validation of his theory.

Factor-based Personality Theory

With respect to personality, major contributions to the empirical understanding of personality are found in factor-based models. Essentially, these models use factor analysis to combine descriptive adjectives of traits into major factors which subsume these lesser-order traits. For example, the trait of "moodiness" or being "touchy" is one facet of the larger factor of "Neuroticism." In turn, other traits combine with moodiness to form the major factor of Neuroticism. Through factor analysis, researchers have identified three or five basic factors that describe normal personality. These models are known as the PEN theory (Eysenck, 1982) and five-factor model of personality (Digman, 1990; McCrae, 1992), respectively.

Two major characteristics of these factor-based models are those of dimensionality and normal distribution. Dimensionality refers to the fact that each factor contains a bipolar reference point. That is, the factor of Neuroticism may be contrasted with its polar reference point of Stability. Further, each personality factor is viewed as normally distributed within the population. In the case of Openness to Experience (which is viewed as one factor), the majority of individuals (68%) fall within the normal range, or within one standard deviation of the mean. Although subject to various scientific definitions, individuals who score above one standard deviation in either direction may be viewed as either more or less open to experience than individuals who score within the normal range. The characteristics of dimensionality and normal distribution allow comparisons between individuals on each personality factor.

Both the three-factor and five-factor theories view personality as a stable characteristic. This stability is across situations and the life-span. Note that situational determinants do exist. That is, a child who is "shy" in the school environment may be less "shy" at home. However, relative to other individuals, the child is still more "shy" than others in the same situations. This relativity to other individuals is often overlooked, and points to the importance of both personality and environment in describing human behaviors and attitudes such as prejudice.

Three-factor model of personality

Eysenck's (1982) three major factors include Extroversion-Introversion (E), Neuroticism-Stability (N), and Psychoticism (P) (versus superego). Extroversion-Introversion refers to an individual's basic orientation to others. Extroverts are characterized as gregarious, sociable, and

friendly. Introverts, on the other hand, have much fewer needs for affiliation, and prefer solitary activity. Neuroticism-Stability is concerned with an individual's level of emotionality and maladjustment. Those high in Neuroticism are characterized as anxious, self-conscious, and emotional. They tend to be reactive to events, as opposed to "taking things in stride." There is little in the literature to suggest that Extroversion would relate to prejudice. However, there is ample reason to suspect Neuroticism and Psychoticism as important factors in Authoritarianism and prejudice.

Neuroticism is associated with low self-esteem, negative affect, and insecurity. High N scorers are viewed as high-strung, emotional, and irritable. The following items can be found on the scale measuring Neuroticism:

Do you worry about awful things that might happen? (yes)

Are you an irritable person? (yes)

Do you often feel "fed-up"? (yes)

Psychoticism (P) is the third factor in Eysenck's theory. This factor is composed of individual features including egocentricity, cynicism, impulsivity, aggression, and lack of empathy. Further, high P scorers are viewed as impersonal and cold, and are generally unconcerned about the rights of others. In simple terms, P can be viewed as a dimension of tough-mindedness versus tender-mindedness. High P scorers are overrepresented in criminality and antisocial conduct disorders (Eysenck, 1977). Tough-mindedness, which relates to P, is closely associated with Authoritarianism (Eysenck & Coulter, 1972). It is important to note that P is dimensional, which means that individuals can be characterized as possessing "more or less" of these traits. The following items are found on the scale measuring Psychoticism:

Do you dislike people who don't know how to behave themselves? (Yes)

Should people always respect the law? (No)

Do you enjoy practical jokes that can sometimes really hurt people? (Yes)

Can you on the whole trust people to tell the truth? (No)

Five-factor model of personality

More recently, the Five-factor model of personality (Digman, 1990; McCrae, 1992) has been advanced as a comprehensive model of normal personality. In addition to Eysenck's Extraversion and Neuroticism, this model includes Openness to Experience (versus closed), Agreeableness-Disagreeableness, and Conscientiousness (versus not). Based upon the history of

personality and prejudice, it can be hypothesized that Openness to Experience would share the greatest relationship with prejudice. Hence, this factor will be described in greater detail. As mentioned previously, there is also evidence that Neuroticism is important in prejudice.

The factor of Openness to Experience (Digman, 1990; McCrae, 1992) is associated with six major characteristics. These include fantasy (daydreaming), aesthetics (appreciation for art and beauty), feelings (receptivity to inner feelings and positive evaluation of emotion), actions (willingness to try new activities), ideas (intellectual curiosity), and values (readiness to examine social, political, and religious values).

In general, openness involves active seeking and appreciation of experiences for their own sake. Open individuals are construed as imaginative, curious, and willing to consider novel ideas and unconventional values. They are receptive to fantasy and imaginal activities and have a strong appreciation for art and beauty. High openness is associated with deeper and more differentiated emotional states and both happiness and unhappiness is experienced more intensely than in individuals low in openness. Variety and novelty is preferred to routine. Openness is also associated with receptivity to intellectual interests and consideration of unconventional ideas. This may also be expressed in a readiness to explore, debate, and examine traditional values. Established authority is often rejected in favor of personally examined values and philosophies.

Closed individuals, on the other hand, are conventional in belief and attitude, set in their ways, and conservative in their tastes. They tend to be task-focused, and may view fantasy or daydreaming as a "waste of time." Individuals low in Openness tend to hold rigid beliefs and are frequently dogmatic. They may find change difficult, avoid novel experiences, and prefer to stick with the "tried and true." With respect to feelings, individuals low in Openness do not believe feeling states hold much importance, and they may have blunted affect. They tend to accept authority and honor tradition, with ready acceptance of conservative institutions.

The following items are drawn from the Openness to Experience scale:

I often try new and foreign foods. (yes)

Aesthetic and artistic concerns aren't very important to me (no)

I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition. (no)

The other two factors in this theory include Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Briefly, individuals high in Agreeableness are characterized as trusting, straightforward, altruistic, compliant, and tender-minded. Individuals high in Conscientiousness are competent, orderly, dutiful, self-disciplined, and deliberative. Although both of these factors may relate to Authoritarianism, they are likely to be less important than Psychoticism and Openness to Experience. Nevertheless, this presently remains an empirical question.

Current Literature on Personality and Prejudice

A thorough review of the empirical literature on prejudice and personality indicates a pronounced emphasis on sociocultural (as opposed to personologic) explanations of prejudice. Indeed, an appropriate summary statement regarding current knowledge is that of Dunbar (1995) who wrote, "there has been very little contemporary attention to the measurement of personality traits associated with prejudice" (p. 270).

Although prejudice does indeed involve intergroup phenomena, the salient question remains regarding why individuals select into ingroups and the role of personality factors in this selection. That is, are there certain personality features that predispose an individual to join a group that, in turn, promotes prejudice? The answer to this question has been elusive.

There are no published articles directly addressing factor-based models of personality and prejudice. However, several articles indirectly address this issue. These articles, combined with historical knowledge, suggest the need for empirical research into the factors of Psychoticism, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience and their relation to prejudice.

Correlates of Right-Wing Authoritarianism

Much of the contemporary literature on personality and prejudice involves the concept of right-wing Authoritarianism (RWA), identified as an "individual factor, a personality variable, a trait if you like, developed on the premise that some persons need very little situation pressure to (say) submit to authority, while others often require significantly more" (Altemeyer, 1988, p. 3). Notably, the construct of RWA does not explain why a person would "need very little situation pressure to submit to authority." Although Altemeyer and others have not investigated the factors of personality *per se*, some of the research findings are relevant to the concepts of Openness to Experience, Psychoticism, and Neuroticism. Hence, the following summary of research on right-wing Authoritarianism is necessarily selective.

Research suggests that those high in RWA have a punishment and obedience orientation to morality. Thus, their moral reasoning and decisions regarding punishment are based on the need for strict consequences for misdeeds, not upon individual principles of conscience. In a study of those high on RWA, the relation between a primitive punishment and obedience orientation was approximately .60 (Altemeyer, 1988). Similarly, in a mock learning situation, RWA Scale scores correlated .43 with the level of punishment chosen (Altemeyer, 1988). More recently, Walker, Rowe, and Quinsey (1993) found that Authoritarianism (and sex role adherence) were significantly related to self-reported past and potential future sexually aggressive behavior among both college and community males.

Individuals high in RWA also display harsher, more judgmental attitudes towards social issues. For example, Peterson, Doty, and Winter (1993) demonstrated that such individuals were more likely to condone punitive sentiments and solutions to problems such as drug abuse and AIDS. Further, such individuals display negative attitudes towards traditionally liberal causes such as concern for the environment, academic freedom, and concern for the homeless.

RWA is highly related to religion and this is likely causally bi-directional (Altemeyer, 1988). Altemeyer presents evidence that those high in Authoritarianism readily submit to established authority such as the church or religious teachings. In examining religious high authoritarians, there was also a lack of questioning regarding religious beliefs. Thus, biblical writings were not viewed as contradictory or irrational and concepts such as evil and satan are uncritically accepted. The relation between Authoritarianism and religious fundamentalism was replicated by Wylie and Forest (1992), who demonstrated a significant positive correlation. Further, these authors demonstrated that Authoritarianism was a reliable predictor of homophobia, racial and ethnic prejudice, and punitiveness.

Replicated studies demonstrate two characteristics consistently associated with RWA: fear of the world as a dangerous place, and self-righteousness. In an interesting discussion, Altemeyer (1988) examines the covariation between authoritarian submission and authoritarian aggression. Essentially, the feature of self-righteousness is hypothesized to allow an individual who is submissive to authority to aggress against certain individuals. Those high in authoritarianism view themselves as morally superior compared to others. This self-righteousness foments aggressive behavior that is justifiable in the name of a "good cause" or higher principle. A classic example would be that of the police officer beating a prisoner to extract information. To use Altemeyer's words, "Social and rational inhibitions against hurting another person can be overpowered by feelings of moral superiority" (Altemeyer, 1988, p. 185).

Psychoticism, authoritarianism, prejudice

Cunningham, Dollinger, Satz, and Rotter (1991) examined the personality correlates of prejudice against AIDS victims. In this study, they looked at several correlates of Authoritarianism, including tough-mindedness, defined as low nurturance and high aggression. Tough-mindedness entails a rejection of tenderness combined with the positive valuing of toughness. These authors also explored the role of low intelligence, self-righteousness, absolutist thinking, and gender. Although all of these variables were moderately correlated with prejudice towards AIDS victims, authoritarianism (r = .34), nurturance (r = -.34), self-righteousness (r = .37), and ethical relativism (r = -.37) were most highly related. Interestingly, these authors did not measure tough-mindedness (which correlates with the factor of Psychoticism) with a factor-based instrument such as the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1976). Instead, they used scales from the Jackson (1974) Personality Research Form. It would be of interest to examine tough-mindedness and prejudice through administration of the EPQ-R, which measures the broader and more inclusive factor of Psychoticism.

12

As noted earlier, Psychoticism includes features of cynicism, aggression, hostility, eccentric thinking, and mistrust of others. The relation between Psychoticism and prejudice has been examined by Zaleski, Eysenck, and Eysenck (1995). These authors found that high scorers on Psychoticism displayed less tolerant and less humanitarian attitudes towards "marginal" social groups. These groups included prostitutes, drug addicts, black marketeers, and sex offenders. Hence, Psychoticism was implicated in intolerant attitudes and punitiveness towards such outgroup members.

Psychoticism also plays a role in interpersonal aggression. Slee and Rigby (1993) found that Psychoticism was signficantly related to children's (aged 7-13 years) tendency to bully others. Similarly, Sommer, Barnes, and Murray (1992) found that Psychoticism was a significant risk factor in the occurrence of partner abuse when females are the perpetrators of the abuse. Eysenck and Coulter (1972) examined attitudes and personality characteristics of Communists and Fascists. They administered a number of instruments including the California Fascism Scale (F), the Rokeach Social Map Test (measuring rigidity), the California Rigidity Test, and the Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire. Factor analysis of the groups, done separately, produced four factors: Tough-mindedness, rigidity, intolerance of ambiguity, and indirect aggression. Significant differences existed between the groups, with both Communists and Fascists being more tough-minded, authoritarian, rigid, intolerant of ambiguity, and emphatic in attitudes than the control group. Eysenck and Coulter (1972) concluded that "Authoritarianism appears to be closely related to tough-mindedness" (p. 70).

Later research associated Psychoticism, or tough-mindedness, with radicalism in college females. Nagoshi, Pitts, and Nakata (1993) administered the Radicalism-Conservatism Scale and a measure of Psychoticism to 276 college females and demonstrated a positive correlation between this variable and radical tendencies. This study supports the emphatic attitudes in Communists and Fascists identified by Eysenck and Coulter (1972). It is possible that Psychoticism may account for an emphatic (or tough-minded) stance towards issues.

Attitude toward authority and Psychoticism has been examined. Interestingly, Rigby and Slee (1993) found that attitude toward institutional authority was negatively correlated with Psychoticism within a group of adolescent males (aged 9-12 years). However, Heaven and Furnham (1991) found that proauthority attitudes and behavior were significantly related to Psychoticism within 185 adolescents (aged 16-18 years). Hence, the research on Psychoticism and attitudes toward authority is not definitive regarding whether the relation is positive or inverse.

In sum, the empirical literature on Psychoticism, Authoritarianism, and prejudice suggests shared variance around tough-mindedness, punitiveness and hostility toward outgroups, and intolerance.

Neuroticism and prejudice

Neuroticism and low self-esteem have been associated with racist attitudes. Using British samples, Bagley, Verman, Mallick, and Young (1979) reported weak to moderate correlations between measures of racial prejudice, neuroticism, and low self-esteem. Although the correlations were weak to moderate, they were consistent. Similarly, using subjects from India, consistent relationships between anxiety (which is a large component of Neuroticism), low self-esteem, and prejudice have been demonstrated. It is uncertain whether Neuroticism *per se* is associated with prejudice, or whether the self-esteem aspect of Neuroticism contributes to the relationship. Research is needed to examine the facets, or trait features of Neuroticism, one of which is low self-esteem.

In reviewing the possible reasons for the relation between low self-esteem and prejudice, Duckitt (1992) notes the association is likely a product of generalized negativity towards others, regardless of whether they are ingroup or outgroup members. He further writes that this generalized negativity likely results from chronic negative affect combined with low self-esteem. Although Duckitt does not specifically address this point in his review, it is important to note that chronic negative affect is yet another feature associated with the personality factor of Neuroticism.

Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, and Prejudice

There is no empirical literature relating Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, and Conscientiousness to Authoritarianism and prejudice. However, it is notable that some writers (e.g., Eysenck, 1992) have provided evidence these factors are actually readily subsumed under the construct of Psychoticism. Despite the absence of published literature, it can be hypothesized that Authoritarianism and prejudice would relate to low Agreeableness and high Conscientiousness. Such a relation, however, remains to be demonstrated.

Synthesizing Personologic Factors: Future Research

Throughout the literature, there are several consistent themes across theories of the authoritarian personality. First, conventionalism has been identified by Allport (1954), Adorno et al. (1950), and Altemeyer (1981; 1988); and Rokeach (1960) wrote of individuals high in "dogmatism." Another major theme is inability to tolerate ambiguity, inability to see the middle ground on an issue, and lack of imaginative or creative influences. This has been variously referred to as dichotomization and need for definiteness (Allport, 1954), a closed way of thinking independent of specific ideologies (Rokeach, 1960), and superstition, stereotyping and anti-intraception (Adorno et al., 1950). Additionally, a consistent theme emerges around unquestioning submission to authority figures. Finally, there are consistencies regarding authority-approved punitiveness against others carried out through a judgmental self-righteousness. This has been variously described as intolerance for those with opposing beliefs (Rokeach, 1960), and authoritarian aggression (Adorno, 1950; Altemeyer, 1981; 1988).

14

As noted throughout this paper, the literature on personality has identified three factors likely important to the authoritarian personality. These three factors are Psychoticism, Neuroticism and Openness to Experience. Specifically, it can be hypothesized that prejudiced authoritarians would be high in Psychoticism and Neuroticism and low in Openness to Experience. It is also likely the authoritarian personality would be low on Agreeableness and highly Conscientious. Research is needed regressing authoritarianism on both the three and five factors models of personality to ascertain the relative contributions to prejudice.

Interventions

In discussing change of prejudice, Duckitt (1992) identifies three levels of intervention. The first level involves change in social structure and intergroup relations. The next level examines the type of social influences to which an individual is exposed, and targets these influences. The third level concerns that of "individual susceptibility" to prejudice (Duckitt, 1992, p. 251), and involves internal, individual change. In this vein, it is common to use psycho-therapeutic techniques, both in individual and group modalities. For example, Bagley, et al. (1979) used a group counseling intervention to boost self-esteem in a sample of British high school students. They found that an increase in self-esteem was significantly correlated with positive changes in racial attitudes.

Counseling approaches within the framework of the five-factor model of personality have been advocated by writers such as Miller (1991). The counseling approach most advocated is cognitive-behavioral. This method focuses on information, knowledge, awareness, and understanding of personality and its influence on thoughts and behavior. A second approach is more experiential, with emphasis on group dynamics and corrective emotional experiences to effect change toward outgroup members. This latter approach often occurs in a group or workshop setting.

Positive effects of cognitive approaches on change in prejudice have been found in certain programs, particularly programs requiring active participation and emphasizing intergroup similarities (Stephan & Stephan, 1984; Fisher, 1990). Katz (1978) also looked at racial awareness training where the emphasis is on making participants aware of forms and manifestations of racism. Finally, intercultural training focuses on cultural differences with the goal of developing an empathic understanding of the outgroup's subjective culture. Intercultural misunderstanding and stereotyping from the outgroup's perspective are emphasized and this technique has a positive effect on intergroup attitudes (van den Heuvel & Meertens, 1989).

Cognitive behavioral approaches to individual modification and change of personality traits can be implemented within a group environment. A four-stage model is proposed for maximally effective intervention. The first stage involves identification of personologic tendencies. Within a group setting, individuals can be administered the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1990), which yields a profile of their relative standing on the five factors of personality. Individuals can also be administered the EPQ-R (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1976) to establish their level on the factor of Psychoticism.

The second stage of intervention would consist of education regarding the influence of personality on thoughts and behavior. To use the factor of Openness to Experience as an example, an individual low in Openness would be characterized as somewhat set in their ways and rigid in their beliefs. They may be inflexible and avoid novel experiences, resulting in fixed and stereotypical beliefs. Feelings may be minimized, with consequent lack of empathy for others. Knowledge and education regarding this constellation of features enables self-examination within the framework of normal personality and with an eye toward potential modification.

The third stage would consist of modification of self-statements, automatic thoughts, and increased self-monitoring of cognitive tendencies. Following cognitive behavioral writers such as Beck and Emery (1985), self-statements and attributions can be challenged with alternative perspectives and hypotheses regarding behavior of others. An individual with rigid and inflexible beliefs can be taught challenging belief statements to automatic thoughts. Thus, one who habitually attributes negative characteristics to a certain group can be taught to identify this tendency and challenge it. A classic example of this would be an individual low in Openness who makes the self-statement "Minorities commit crime," and who rigidly maintains this belief. An alternative self-statement could consist of "Poverty contributes to crime," which is not only a different viewpoint but one that is equally plausible as an explanation for crime. Self-monitoring of such automatic thoughts can be taught and efforts directed toward consistent challenging of prejudicial self-statements can be emphasized.

Finally, individuals can be instructed on the role of cognitive self-statements in personal behavior. Role playing exercises can be constructed where new behaviors may be rehearsed. Importantly, these must be embedded within personality tendencies. For example, one who is low in Openness may need extra encouragement to expand their thinking and generate more flexible attributions of behavior. They may also need to actively remind themselves of tendencies to avoid novel thoughts and experiences. Similarly, a cynical and mistrusting individual (who is high in Psychoticism) may need to develop insight into the interactive aspects and potential negative interpersonal consequences of such tendencies. Role-playing can facilitate this process insofar as the individual can adopt an "openness" or "trusting" role and experiment with new behaviors within a group context.

Conclusion

Although it is unlikely that prejudice can be completely eradicated, there exist opportunities for modification of prejudicial tendencies. Knowledge regarding general personality characteristics pertinent to authoritarianism can facilitate this process. Further research is needed to ascertain the contribution of major personality factors to Authoritarianism and prejudice. Such research can inform both preventative and ameliorative strategies for reducing prejudice.

References

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, R.N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.

Allport, G. (1954; 1958; 1979). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Canada: University of Manitoba Press.

----. (1988). *Enemies of freedom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ashmore, R. (1970). The problem of intergroup prejudice. In B.E. Collins (Ed.). *Social psychology* (pp. 245-296). Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley.

Bagley, C., Verman, G., Mallick, J., & Young, L. (1979). *Personality, self-esteem and prejudice*. Westmead, England: Saxon House.

Beck, A.T., & Emergy, G. (1985). *Anxiety disorders and phobias: A cognitive perspective*. New York: Basic Books.

Costa, P.T., Jr., & McCrae, R.R. (1990). *The NEO Personality-Revised Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Cunningham, J., Dollinger, S. J., Satz, M., & Rotter, N. (1991). Personality correlates of prejudice against AIDS victims. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 29(2)*, 165-167.

Dickman, S. (1993). Functional and dysfunctional impulsivity. In W. G. McCown, J. L. Johnson, & M. B. Shure (Eds.), *The impulsive client: theory, research, and intervention*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*, 116-123.

Duckitt, J. (1993). Right-wing authoritarianism among white South African students: Its measurement and correlates. *Journal of Social Psychology, 133(4)*, 553-563.

Duckitt, J. (1992). *The social psychology of prejudice*. London: Praeger.

Dunbar, E. (1995). The prejudiced personality, racism, and anti-Semitism: The PR Scale forty years later. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 65(2)*, 270-277.

Eysenck, H. J. (1954). *The psychology of politics.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

---- (1977). *Crime and personality.* 3rd ed. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

---- (1982). *Personality, genetics, and behavior: Selected papers.* New York: Praeger Publishers.

---- (1992). Four ways five factors are not basic. *Personality and Individual Differences, 13(6),* 667-673.

Eysenck, H. J., & Coulter, T. T. (1972). The Personality and attitudes of working-class British Communists and Fascists. *Journal of Social Psychology, 87,* 59-73.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G., (1976). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire.* London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Eysenck, S. B. G., & Eysenck, H. J. (1963). On the dual nature of extraversion. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 2,* 46-55.

Fisher, R. J. (1990). *The social psychology of intergroup and international conflict resolution.* Berlin: Springer.

Hartley, E. L. (1946). *Problems in prejudice.* New York: King's Crown Press.

Heaven, P. C., & Furnham, A. (1991). Orientation to authority among adolescents: Relationships with personality and human values. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12(10),* 977-982.

Jackson, D. N. (1974). *Personality Research Form manual.* Port Huron, MI: Research Psychologists Press.

Katz, I. (1978). *White awareness: A handbook for anti-racism training.* Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

McCrae, R. R. (1992). The five-factor model: Issues and applications [Special issue]. *Journal of Personality, 60.*

Miller, T. R. (1991). The psychotherapeutic utility of the five-factor model of personality: A clinician's experience. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 57,* 415-433.

Nagoshi, C. T., Pitts, S. C., & Nakata, T. (1993). Intercorrelations of attitudes, personality, and sex role orientation in a college sample. *Personality and Individual Differences, 14(4),* 603-604.

Peterson, Doty, & Winter (1993). Authoritarianism and attitudes toward contemporary social issues. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19(2)*, 174-184.

Rokeach, M. (1960). *The open and closed mind.* New York: Basic books.

---- (1948). Generalized mental rigidity as a factor in ethnocentrism. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 43*, 259-278.

Rubinstein, G. (1996). Two peoples in one land: A validation study of Altemeyer's right-wing authoritarianism scale in the Palestinian and Jewish societies in Israel. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 27(2)*, 216-230.

Slee, P.T., & Rigby, K. (1993). The relationship of Eysenck's personality factors and self-esteem to bully-victim behaviour in Australian schoolboys. *Personality and Individual Differences, 14(2)*, 371-373.

Sommer, R., Barnes, G. E., & Murray, R. P. (1992). Alcohol consumption, alcohol abuse, personality and female perpetrated spouse abuse. *Personality and Individual Differences, 13(12)*, 1315-1323.

Stanford, R.N. (1951). Rigidity Inventory. The Institute of Personality Assessment Research, University of California, Los Angeles.

Stephan, L., & Stephan, P. (1984). The role of ignorance in intergroup relations. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: Psychology of desegregation.* New York: Academic (pp. 229-255).

van den Heuvel, H., & Meertens, R. W. (1989). The culture assimilator: Is it possible to improve interethnic relations by emphasizing ethnic differences? In J. P. van Oudenhoven & T. M. Willemsen (Eds.), *Ethnic minorities: Social psychological perspectives.* Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger (pp. 221-236)

Vaughan, G. M. (1988). The psychology of intergroup discrimination. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 17*, 1-14.

Walker, W. D., Rowe, R. C., & Quinsey, V. L. (1993). Authoritarianism and sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65(5)*, 1036-1045.

Wylie, L., & Forest, J. (1992). Religious fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism and prejudice. *Psychological Reports, 71,(3,Pt 2)*, 1291-1298.

Zaleski, Z., Eysenck, S., & Eysenck, H. (1995). Personality and attitudes towards marginal social groups. *Personality and Individual Differences, 18(5)*, 677-679.